



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,275	10/24/2001	William D. Tierney	M1103.70260US00	3532

45840 7590 01/03/2007  
WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation)  
C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.  
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA  
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER
----------

TANG, KAREN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/03/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/036,275

Applicant(s)

TIERNEY ET AL.

Examiner

Karen C. Tang

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 and 41-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39, 41-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2151

- This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks file on 10/20/06.
- Claims 1-39, 41-47 are amended are for further examination.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 14, 27, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear as of the language “directly” in the independent claims, in the internet environment, unless the device is connect by cable wiring with one another, cannot be view as “directly”. For the examining purpose of this prosecution, the language “directly” is viewed as devices which contacting each other through internet.

It is unclear as of the language “without the assistance of a server”, because the server intervenes the process of process of peer -to - peer collaboration system (please see methods b, c and d), therefore, the collaborative information cannot be viewed as “without the assistance of a server” for the examining purpose.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2151

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 11, 13-18, 24, 26-31, 37, 39 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henrick et al hereinafter Henrick (US 2003/0041108).

1. Referring to Claims 1, 14, 27, and 41, Henrick disclosed

(a) using client software operating in a first device and a second device to connect a first user of the first device to a second user of the second device, without the assistance of a server so that collaborative is sent directly between the first user and second user without an intervening server (refer to 0014), the first user having a first identity in a shared space and the second user having a second identity in the shared space.

(b) sending a request from the management server to the first user to become a managed entity (web page deliver to the device, refer to 0029);

(c) downloading from the management server to the client software a definition file (refer to 0030) containing a definition of the managed entity, and

(d) associating information in the definition file with the first user identity and device information in the client software operating in the first device in order to create the managed entity (0030).

(e) interacting, between the management server and the client software to exchange management information separately from the collaborative information exchanged between the first user and the second user (refer to 0030 and 0031).

Art Unit: 2151

2 Referring to Claims 2, 15, 28, and 42, Henrick disclosed wherein the managed entity is a managed user (peer to peer, managed by the server, refer to 0014) and the definition information file is an injectible identity file (contains identity, refer to 0030 and 0031).

3. Referring to Claims 3, 16, 29, and 43, Henrick disclosed wherein the managed entity is a managed device (peer to peer, managed by the server, refer to 0014) and the definition file is a device information file (refer to 0030 and 0031).

4. Referring to Claims 4, 17, 30 and 44, Henrick disclosed wherein the device file is a Windows REG file (it is inherent that Windows Operating System provides the Windows Reg Files, 0097, 0081)

5. Referring to Claims 5, 18, 31 and 45, Henrick discloses (i) sending at least one license file from the management server to the managed user (refer to 0105);  
and (ii) in response to information in the license file, enabling at least one function in the client software (refer to 0105).

6. Referring to Claims 11, 24, and 37 Henrick disclosed (i) periodically receiving event notifications and statistical information from the client software of the managed user to the management server (refer to 0031, 0039-0040 and 0052-0059).

Art Unit: 2151

7. Referring to Claims 13, 26 and 39, Henrick disclosed wherein event notifications and statistical information are temporarily stored in a memory located at a client site.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 12, 19, 25, 32, 38 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henrick et al hereinafter Henrick (US 20030041108) in view Russel et al hereinafter Russel (US 2002/0069420)

6. Referring to Claims 6, 19, 32 and 46: Henrick disclosed

Although Henrick disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Henrick is silent regarding i) sending at least one policy restriction file from the management server to the managed user; and ii) in response to information in the policy restriction file, restricting at least one function in the client software.

Russell, in an analogous art disclosed a system that deliver content over a network in the peer-to-peer situation where suggest regarding i) sending at least one policy restriction file from the management server to the managed user (refer to 0026, 0037); and

Art Unit: 2151

ii) in response to information in the policy restriction file, restricting at least one function in the client software (refer to 0105).

Hence, providing the methods as disclosed by Russell, would be desired for server providing the restriction file so that the users are forced to follow the policy.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the system of Henrick by including the features which allows the user to be restricted while accessing the system in order to provide privacy and forced the users to follow the policy.

12. Referring to Claims 12, 25 and 38, although Henrick c, Henrick is silence regarding wherein the event notifications include error notification.

Russell, in an analogous art disclosed wherein the event notification wherein the event notifications include error notification (refer to 0107);

Hence, providing the methods as disclosed by Russell, would be desired to provide a error notification that include error notification since in the case when the license expired would require user to update the newest license.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the system of Henrick by including the features which provide the error notification in the system in the case when the file is expired.

Art Unit: 2151

Claims 7-10, 20-23, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henrick et al hereinafter Henrick (US 20030041108) in view Russel et al hereinafter Russel (US 2002/0069420) in further view of England et al hereinafter England.

7. Referring to Claims 7, 20 and 33: Henrick and Russel disclosed

i) creating a client list of licensed components and policy restriction in the client software of the managed user;

although Henrick, Russel disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, they are silent in disclosed ii) sending the client list to the management server;

iii) creating a server list of licensed components and policy restriction in the management server;

iv) comparing the client list to the server list; and

v) adjusting and synchronizing the components in the client software based on the comparison on the step iv).

England, in an analogous art disclosed iii) creating a server list of licensed components and policy restriction in the management server (refer to 0125, 0128, and 0132);

iv) comparing the client list to the server list (refer to 0132); and

v) adjusting and synchronizing the components in the client software based on the comparison on the step iv) (refer to 0132).

Hence, providing the methods as disclosed by England, would be desired to provide method to monitor proper license in the client list to ensure only the valid/paid license is in the client system.



Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the system of Henrick by including the features which provide the revoking the license.

8. Referring to Claims 8, 21, and 34 Henrick discloses (v) comprises downloading and installing licensed components from the management server to the client software which components are on the server list and are not on the client list (refer to 0030).

9. Referring to Claims 9, 22 and 35, although Henrick, Russel disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, they are silent in disclosed wherein step v) further comprises revoking licenses in the client software of components that are on the client list and are not on the server list.

England, in an analogous art disclosed wherein step v) further comprises revoking licenses in the client software of components that are on the client list and are not on the server list (refer to 0132).

Hence, providing the methods as disclosed by England, would be desired to provide method to delete/revoke the license in the client list to ensure only the valid/paid license is in the client system.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the system of Henrick by including the features which provide the revoking the license.

Art Unit: 2151

10. Referring to Claim 10, 23 and 36, although Henrick disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Henrick is silence regarding wherein steps (i) to v) are repeated periodically.

Russell in an analogous art disclosed wherein the step steps (i) to v) are repeated periodically (refer to 0037).

Hence, providing the methods as disclosed by Russell, would be desired to provided to the system due to the fact that it would be practical to check on the license on the users so managed the users only able to use the product/functionality for the duration period of time that they paid for and also that the user would not need to download the functionality again.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the system of Henrick by including the features indicated in Russell to ensure the appropriateness of the license.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39, 41-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2151

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571)272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KT



**ZARNI MAUNG**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER